



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

lar favor, but the message of the Book to us to-day is, "Be valiant; fight the battles of the Lord."

Any one who helps another in the development of Christian character is fighting the Lord's battles. There again the aged man of experiences that have placed the halo of heroism around his head can exert a more potent influence than another. As long as man is given to hero worshipping, that man who is looked upon as a hero should deport himself with double care. His words are reëchoed in the speech of the young that take him as a model. His acts are reflected in their behavior. His very thoughts, unuttered though they may be, as they influence his own being, leave their corresponding impress on the character of his admirers. What a mission for the old soldier in this respect!

After all, what is there better for a nation than that its citizens be men and women of character? The constitution cannot govern alone. A standing army will never keep out the enemy of immoral life and unprincipled conduct. When a nation once becomes rotten at the core, the best safeguarding that statesmen and diplomats can devise for it cannot retard its utter decay, any more than a golden vessel will make a decaying apple last longer. History has repeatedly proven that a morally bad nation cannot long remain a strong nation. Our constitution and our boasted liberties will become a curse to ourselves and to the world as soon as unprincipled men become their custodians. Every lover of this country must therefore feel a deep concern for the moral soundness and character of its citizens. What nobler type of character, what higher code of ethics, could be recommended than the one we call Christian? Do you men still love your country as you did during the days of Lincoln? Are you still willing to further its cause? Do not lament the fact that a wooden leg prevents you from the march, or an empty sleeve proclaims your inability to swing the sword, or a sightless eye incapacitates you to serve behind the field-piece. You can still serve, and serve in a nobler way. You can help oppose that which threatens Christian character. You can fight the Lord's battles of righteousness and truth, and that is a noble service for your country. This war began long before the firing on Fort Sumter; it did not cease with the surrender at Appomattox. Are some of you heroes of Gettysburg? Gettysburg will not be remembered in eternity, but this battle to which I invite makes an eternity of happiness possible. Do some of you presume to be proud because you marched with Sherman to the sea? You can join a happier, prouder host, which follows the Lamb in His triumphant march. Do some of you carry about in your system the virus of Libby prison and Andersonville, which eventually will bring death? Enlist in this holy war and you will get the seal on your forehead which will enter you into life eternal. Do some of you claim the pathetic distinction of belonging to the few survivors of Fort Pillow? In the battle for Jesus Christ even the dead are among the victors, for there to die is gain. There may even be within my hearing some one who befriended the lost cause. You, too, are welcome to join in this great battle, for the men of the gray and the men of the blue fight in the same ranks here; the names "Johnnie" and "Yank" are not known; neither the silent Grant nor the beloved

Lee is commander-in-chief here, but the Man of Sorrows, the Prince of Peace.

But remember, however valiant you may all be in the fight, one by one you will get weary and fall asleep; not in your tents perhaps, for this life is at best only a bivouac. But reveille will sound, not to rouse you to fight, but to join in the great throng, white-robed and joy-faced, singing its Alleluiah to the Lamb that was slain but has conquered.

## How War Demoralizes Men.

*From an address of Hon. William Everett at Northampton, Mass., Saturday evening, April 18.*

If I mistake not, it was Stephen Decatur who originated the saying, "Our country: may she always be in the right, but right or wrong, may she always be victorious," which has been condensed to the aphorism, "Our country, right or wrong." And Stephen Decatur, like Alexander Hamilton, died a sacrifice to that most false of all false sentiments which sustained dueling in contravention of reason and the law of God. When we teach our children to accept the sentiment, "Our country, right or wrong," we place an ill-regulated emotion above reason and the law of God, and ask them to adopt a sentiment which they may repudiate when they arrive at the age of reason.

What is our country? It is not hills and valleys and expanse of territory: it is the men and women who have set up for themselves a government; and it is not the men and women alone who live at the present time, but those who have gone before and left high traditions and those who will come after and are entitled to a worthy inheritance. If the government is the people, is it alone or chiefly those to whom the mass of the people have confided the making of the laws and the direction of government? And shall we surrender at the behest of these, in an idolatry of patriotism, reason and conscience? This is not the definition of our country nor the definition of patriotism. Our country is every one of us, and true patriotism is controlled by reason and conscience in each of us and not directed by the leaders whom the people have set up. Some there are who say that a majority vote and a majority expression by the organs of popular opinion establishes what is right. But Socrates did not think so when he was asked to identify might with right, and to say that the man who has the power to do a thing possesses by virtue of his power the evidence of his right to do it. He replied that he could not hold it so, and dared to say that "I alone" maintain that might and justice are not the same. John Bright did not think so when he denounced the Crimean War in the English Parliament amid the jeers of the members, and those who have come after have seen clearly that the Crimean War was unnecessary and therefore wrong. John Hampden, for whom your county was named before it was set off from the larger territory, did not think so when he refused to pay ship money of twenty shillings, and the world agreed with him when the corn laws were repealed. If a man know before God that his country is wrong, it is impious for him to surrender to a majority, aye, to a vast majority. It is our duty to read and learn from history. We may have vast natural resources, wonder-

fully developed by the intelligence of our citizens; we may have great moral advantages, which have made this country the home of the oppressed from every land, but, for all that, we are what the Declaration of Independence proclaims us to be — one among the nations of the earth, and what has been written in history was written for our learning.

What are the things which we condemn in the history of other nations? Where do we fix our censure? Our disapproval has fallen nowhere more clearly or emphatically than upon those acts whereby one nation has sought to extend its territory by conquest; whereby nations have sent their armies beyond their own territories and forced unwilling peoples of no kindred or connection to come under their yoke. If in this regard we condemn Macedonia and Rome and France, if England was wrong in its oppression of the American colonies, if Spain was wrong in its treatment of the Cubans, if these and many other examples show that eager sacrifice and patriotic devotion have been wasted and given when a cause was wrong, what right have we to claim that it may not be so with us? What right have we to say that we alone are right? How do we know that the verdict of history shall not be pronounced against us? Let us rather confess that, if it is wrong, before God and before conscience, for other nations to traverse land and sea to bring into subjugation unwilling peoples, that same thing is wrong in the United States, and that the so-called patriot who glorifies his country, right or wrong, is no true patriot, but would place upon her head a crown of thorns and scourge her before he garbs her in a purple robe. Let us be honest with ourselves and admit the conclusion that, if these things are wrong for others, they are wrong for us; that, no matter what the Senate, the popular Assembly, the judges and popular opinion may pronounce, it is not right for our troops to trample down the inhabitants of the Philippines and make them our subjects against their will.

Another thing which we condemn in other nations is the crime, the sin, the blunder of war. Cicero said that he preferred the most unjust peace to the most just war, and Franklin declared that there never had been a bad peace or a good war. War is in itself always inherently and inevitably bad. There may be times when good comes of it, as good comes of surgery. We do not deceive ourselves to the point of believing that surgery is in itself other than terrible or that it has any place other than that of a last desperate resort, and you know of the doctrine of conservative surgery, which has saved whole thousands of bodies and preserved thousands of lives. It is said that when London was destroyed by the great conflagration it destroyed the germs of the recurring pestilence, and there has not been a pestilence in London since. But we know a better way of combating pestilence than the burning of cities. Wars kill off the very men who would be the life and strength of the country, and those who survive are likely to be the men who could be more easily spared. And to the period immediately following war leaves a legacy of passions which have no place in the human heart. This period, no matter to what extent the struggle has been characterized by devotion and sacrifice, is one of national degradation and corruption. Such a period which followed our Civil War is yet clear in memory, with its evidence

that the conscience of the people and the quality of public service were never on so low a plane. You have heard General Sherman's declaration that war is hell, and to that I add that soldiers are devils employed amid the environment of the infernal regions, and not in the pure air of peace and patriotism. And, in saying this, I refer to the circumstances of war, not in all cases to the causes which produce it; to what the work of a soldier is and to the direction such employment gives to character, not to those by whom these influences are successfully resisted. We have been told that we should not criticise a war while it is in progress. Grant said after the Mexican War that it was wrong. Webster opposed it before it was entered upon. It was right for Webster to take this attitude in 1845, and for Grant to support it after 1848, but it was, we may infer, from some recent teaching, the duty of Webster and Grant to lie about the matter in 1846 and 1847. That is the way war demoralizes men.

If we know of the atrocities of soldiers, we are adjured in the name of patriotism not to mention them and not to bring the perpetrators to just punishment. This is the theory of that false patriotism that raises the cry, "Our country, right or wrong." In the agitation for the abolition of slavery and in the sermon of Channing, which has never been answered to this day, the same severe and true things were said of war that were said of slavery. It was said that the demoralizing effects of slavery were even greater upon the master than upon the slave; and it was said that war worked a greater injury upon the victor than upon the vanquished. Dueling was taken up as a means of vindication of honor, but when intelligence and conscience had reached a point which made the custom an affront to civilization, laws were enacted for its suppression, notwithstanding that no provision was made for meeting the needs of wounded honor, often fanciful and absurd, which constituted the grounds for a duel. Like notions of national honor lead most often to war, and reason and conscience demand that wars must cease. Dueling was often a farce, and wars of honor are likely to be closed by treaties of peace equally inadequate and inconclusive. But, upon the appearance of opportunity, we have forgotten our detestation of wars of conquest, our knowledge of the bitter fruits of all war, and have readily entered upon war with all its horrors, and that a war of subjugation, with no better excuse than the trite and discredited one of benevolent assimilation. The true patriot loves his country as a father loves his children, as I love my pupils; but am I not, because I love my pupils, to check, to control and warn them and to maintain my authority? And the authority and responsibility in this country is the part of every man and woman in it.

---

### New Books.

**MILITARISM.** By Guglielmo Ferrero. Translated from the Italian. 8vo, 320 pages. London: Ward, Lock & Co. Price, 12 shillings.

This English edition of Mr. Ferrero's scholarly work on "Militarism" is an important addition to the literature of the subject now open to English readers. The Italian work, first published in 1898, aroused a good